



**CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
TWO YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000**

**From The Office Of State Auditor
Claire McCaskill**

**Report No. 2001-93
September 24, 2001
www.auditor.state.mo.us**

AUDIT REPORT



Office Of The
State Auditor Of Missouri
Claire McCaskill

September 2001

IMPORTANT: The Missouri State Auditor is required by Missouri law to conduct audits only once every four years in counties, like Crawford, which do not have a county auditor. However, to assist such counties in meeting federal audit requirements, the State Auditor will also perform a financial and compliance audit of various county operating funds every two years. This voluntary service to Missouri counties can only be provided when state auditing resources are available and does not interfere with the State Auditor's constitutional responsibility of auditing state government.

Once every four years, the State Auditor's statutory audit will cover additional areas of county operations, as well as the elected county officials, as required by Missouri's Constitution.

This audit of Crawford County included additional areas of county operations, as well as the elected county officials. The following concerns were noted as part of the audit:

- The county has not sufficiently reduced its general revenue property tax levy to reduce property tax revenues by 50 percent of sales tax revenues as provided in the ballot issue passed by Crawford County voters under state law. Procedural errors, together with actual sales tax collections exceeding estimated amounts has resulted in the county having collected excess property tax revenues. Additional reductions will need to be made in future years to the property tax levy to fully adjust for the \$35,898 excess property taxes collected in prior years.
- Bids were not always solicited, nor was bid documentation always retained for various purchases made by the county during the audit period. The County Commission paid \$92,535 for a paving project which was not awarded to the low bidder. The paving project was bid twice and the same company was the low bidder each time. The county paid an additional \$8,000 on this project because they did not select the low bidder. In the minutes the County Commission indicated that they awarded the contract to the high bidder because the firm was located in the county.
- A state law, Section 50.333.13, RSMo, enacted in 1997, allowed salary commissions meeting in 1997 to provide mid-term salary increases for associate county commissioners elected in 1996 due to the fact that their terms were increased from two years to four. Based on this law, in 1999 Crawford County's Associate County Commissioners salaries were each increased approximately \$5,000 yearly according to the County Clerk.

(over)

YELLOW SHEET

On May 15, 2001, the Missouri Supreme Court handed down an opinion that holds that all raises given pursuant to this statute section are unconstitutional. Based on the Supreme Court decision, the raises given to each of the Associate County Commissioners, totaling approximately \$10,000 for the two years ended December 31, 2000, should be repaid.

- The County Collector has not prepared or filed annual settlements for the years ended February 28 (29) 2001, 2000, and 1999, with the County Commission as required by state law. A draft of the settlement for the year ended February 28, 2001 was prepared upon request in April 2001. Various amounts on the draft were inaccurate and did not agree to the tax books, some activity was not included, and the draft settlement did not balance. In addition, the County Collector does not reconcile daily collections to paid tax receipts or deposits in the bank account and does not compare the reconciled monthly bank balance to the related liabilities. For example, at February 28, 2001, identified liabilities totaled approximately \$1,500 more than the reconciled bank balance. Other concerns regarding the County Collector's operations were also noted.
- The financial statement for the year ended December 31, 1999 was not published until January 17, 2001. The County Clerk stated that the financial statement was not published because of problems caused by the conversion to a new computerized accounting system in March 1999 and the amounts had to be manually recalculated to prepare an accurate financial statement for publication. In addition, the activity of some county funds was not included as required.

The audit also includes some matters related to the purchase of land, a reimbursement not received, fringe benefits, fixed assets, reporting of expenditures of federal awards, property tax system, E911 Board, and the Crawford County Nursing Service, upon which the county should consider and take appropriate corrective action. Several of these issues had been noted in prior audits.

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<hr/> <u>FINANCIAL SECTION</u> <hr/>	
State Auditor's Reports:	2-6
Financial Statements and Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards	3-4
Compliance and Internal Control Over Financial Reporting Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With <i>Government Auditing Standards</i>	5-6
Financial Statements:	7-16
<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
A-1	Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash - Various Funds Year Ended December 31, 2000
A-2	Year Ended December 31, 1999
B	Comparative Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Cash - Budget and Actual - Various Funds, Years Ended December 31, 2000 and 1999
Notes to the Financial Statements:	17-20
Supplementary Schedule:	21-24
Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards, Years Ended December 31, 2000 and 1999	22-24
Notes to the Supplementary Schedule	25-27
<hr/> <u>FEDERAL AWARDS - SINGLE AUDIT SECTION</u> <hr/>	
State Auditor's Report:	29-31
Compliance With Requirements Applicable to Each Major Program and Internal Control Over Compliance in Accordance With OMB Circular A-133	30-31

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<hr/> <u>FEDERAL AWARDS - SINGLE AUDIT SECTION</u> <hr/>	
Schedule:.....	32-34
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Including Management's Plan for Corrective Action), Years Ended December 31, 2000 and 1999.....	33-34
Section I - Summary of Auditor's Results.....	33-34
Section II - Financial Statement Findings.....	34
Section III - Federal Award Findings and Questioned Costs.....	34
Follow-Up on Prior Audit Findings for an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With <i>Government Auditing Standards</i>	35-36
Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings in Accordance With OMB Circular A-133.....	37-38
<hr/> <u>MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT SECTION</u> <hr/>	
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings.....	40-57
<u>Number</u>	
1. County Procedures.....	42
2. Salaries and Fringe Benefits.....	45
3. Financial Reporting.....	47
4. Fixed Assets.....	48
5. Property Tax System.....	50
6. County Collector's Accounting Controls and Procedures.....	51
7. Nursing Service Accounting Controls and Procedures.....	54
8. E911.....	55
Follow-Up on Prior Audit Findings.....	58-68
<hr/> <u>STATISTICAL SECTION</u> <hr/>	
History, Organization, and Statistical Information.....	70-75

FINANCIAL SECTION

State Auditor's Reports



CLAIRE C. McCASKILL
Missouri State Auditor

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON THE FINANCIAL
STATEMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE OF
EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

To the County Commission
and
Officeholders of Crawford County, Missouri

We have audited the accompanying special-purpose financial statements of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, as of and for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999, as identified in the table of contents. These special-purpose financial statements are the responsibility of the county's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these special-purpose financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the special-purpose financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the special-purpose financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and the significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

The accompanying special-purpose financial statements were prepared for the purpose of presenting the receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, and comparisons of such information with the corresponding budgeted information for various funds of the county and are not intended to be a complete presentation of the financial position and results of operations of those funds or of Crawford County.

In our opinion, the special-purpose financial statements referred to in the first paragraph present fairly, in all material respects, the receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, and comparisons of such information with the corresponding budgeted information for various funds of the county as of and for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999, in conformity with the comprehensive basis of accounting discussed in Note 1, which is a basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we also have issued our report dated June 28, 2001, on our consideration of the county's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* and should be read in conjunction with this report in considering the results of our audit.

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*, and is not a required part of the special-purpose financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the special-purpose financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the special-purpose financial statements taken as a whole.

The accompanying History, Organization, and Statistical Information is presented for informational purposes. This information was obtained from the management of Crawford County, Missouri, and was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the special-purpose financial statements referred to above.



Claire McCaskill
State Auditor

June 28, 2001 (fieldwork completion date)

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Director of Audits:	Thomas J. Kremer, CPA
Audit Manager:	Douglas J. Porting, CPA
In-Charge Auditor:	Heather M. Thompson
Audit Staff:	Norma Payne
	Jay Ross



CLAIRE C. McCASKILL
Missouri State Auditor

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE
AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING
BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED
IN ACCORDANCE WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS*

To the County Commission
and
Officeholders of Crawford County, Missouri

We have audited the special-purpose financial statements of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, as of and for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999, and have issued our report thereon dated June 28, 2001. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Compliance

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the special-purpose financial statements of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of the county's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*. However, we noted certain immaterial instances of noncompliance which are described in the accompanying Management Advisory Report.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the special-purpose financial statements of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, we considered the county's internal control over financial reporting in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the special-purpose financial statements and not to provide assurance on the internal control over financial reporting. Our consideration of the internal control over financial reporting would not

necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control over financial reporting that might be material weaknesses. A material weakness is a condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that misstatements in amounts that would be material in relation to the special-purpose financial statements being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. We noted no matters involving the internal control over financial reporting and its operation that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, we noted other matters involving the internal control over financial reporting which are described in the accompanying Management Advisory Report.

This report is intended for the information of the management of Crawford County, Missouri; federal awarding agencies and pass-through entities; and other applicable government officials. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Claire McCaskill". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Claire McCaskill
State Auditor

June 28, 2001 (fieldwork completion date)

Financial Statements

Exhibit A-1

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - VARIOUS FUNDS
 YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000

Fund	Cash, January 1	Receipts	Disbursements	Cash, December 31
General Revenue	\$ 55,521	1,991,860	2,008,662	38,719
Special Road and Bridge	1,251,305	1,772,032	1,712,469	1,310,868
Assessment	22,394	145,954	135,806	32,542
Law Enforcement Training	5,112	8,079	6,234	6,957
Prosecuting Attorney Training	3,089	1,281	2,402	1,968
ADA Capital Improvement	62,414	3,866	39	66,241
Handicap	133,718	8,284	0	142,002
Courthouse and Jail Capital Improvement	105,968	117,093	98,131	124,930
Prosecuting Attorney Bad Check	4,945	9,869	13,288	1,526
Prosecuting Attorney Delinquent Tax	1,226	74	50	1,250
Records Preservation	5,096	11,782	9,746	7,132
Law Enforcement Equipment	3,112	8,428	7,814	3,726
Sheriff's Special	11,235	39,260	32,537	17,958
Children's Trust	5,505	1,292	6,000	797
Special Law Enforcement	3,746	2,471	4,900	1,317
Emergency 911	97,716	372,659	358,046	112,329
Family Access	951	90	0	1,041
Missouri Department of Conservation	15,711	0	7,981	7,730
Circuit Clerk Interest	306	10,684	8,094	2,896
Associate Circuit Interest	1,770	4,726	2,779	3,717
Law Library	23,620	11,191	14,752	20,059
Election Service	0	909	0	909
Senior Citizens Service	0	7,783	0	7,783
Total	\$ 1,814,460	4,529,667	4,429,730	1,914,397

The accompanying Notes to the Financial Statements are an integral part of this statement.

Exhibit A-2

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - VARIOUS FUNDS
 YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1999

Fund	Cash, January 1	Receipts	Disbursements	Cash, December 31
General Revenue	\$ 27,022	1,853,656	1,825,157	55,521
Special Road and Bridge	959,051	1,900,438	1,608,184	1,251,305
Assessment	25,812	165,400	168,818	22,394
Law Enforcement Training	1,884	11,073	7,845	5,112
Prosecuting Attorney Training	3,405	1,525	1,841	3,089
ADA Capital Improvement	57,120	6,957	1,663	62,414
Handicap	125,826	7,892	0	133,718
Courthouse and Jail Capital Improvement	40,525	106,263	40,820	105,968
Prosecuting Attorney Bad Check	5,721	10,209	10,985	4,945
Prosecuting Attorney Delinquent Tax	1,154	72	0	1,226
Records Preservation	4,749	13,247	12,900	5,096
Law Enforcement Equipment	6,345	8,669	11,902	3,112
Sheriff's Special	42,569	53,133	84,467	11,235
Children's Trust	4,293	1,212	0	5,505
Special Law Enforcement	10,454	4,416	11,124	3,746
Emergency 911	154,517	362,495	419,296	97,716
Family Access	0	951	0	951
Missouri Department of Conservation	0	69,300	53,589	15,711
Circuit Clerk Interest	7	7,728	7,429	306
Associate Circuit Interest	3,669	4,080	5,979	1,770
Law Library	15,141	10,599	2,120	23,620
Total	\$ 1,489,264	4,599,315	4,274,119	1,814,460

The accompanying Notes to the Financial Statements are an integral part of this statement.

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
TOTALS - VARIOUS FUNDS						
RECEIPTS	\$ 4,743,794	4,494,374	(249,420)	4,258,169	4,506,657	248,488
DISBURSEMENTS	5,375,857	4,404,105	971,752	4,696,510	4,205,002	491,508
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(632,063)	90,269	722,332	(438,341)	301,655	739,996
CASH, JANUARY 1	1,788,764	1,788,764	0	1,470,447	1,470,447	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	1,156,701	1,879,033	722,332	1,032,106	1,772,102	739,996
GENERAL REVENUE FUND						
RECEIPTS						
Property taxes	201,957	137,474	(64,483)	135,000	138,147	3,147
Sales taxes	800,000	797,469	(2,531)	729,604	734,433	4,829
Intergovernmental	604,438	570,556	(33,882)	566,268	526,297	(39,971)
Charges for services	425,000	369,912	(55,088)	397,000	382,600	(14,400)
Interest	7,500	8,605	1,105	6,000	6,382	382
Other	34,700	70,742	36,042	27,500	31,052	3,552
Transfers in	37,484	37,102	(382)	39,200	34,745	(4,455)
Total Receipts	2,111,079	1,991,860	(119,219)	1,900,572	1,853,656	(46,916)
DISBURSEMENTS						
County Commission	83,097	82,268	829	72,216	72,004	212
County Clerk	78,216	76,805	1,411	80,351	78,970	1,381
Elections	74,393	84,074	(9,681)	9,500	8,131	1,369
Buildings and grounds	67,997	63,234	4,763	70,000	66,977	3,023
Employee fringe benefits	3,000	17,820	(14,820)	165,875	138,819	27,056
County Treasurer	32,296	31,218	1,078	29,458	28,163	1,295
County Collector	98,406	95,146	3,260	82,111	81,882	229
Ex Officio Recorder of Deeds	46,104	43,158	2,946	38,177	37,358	819
Circuit Clerk	13,200	10,979	2,221	13,400	12,387	1,013
Associate Circuit Court	9,100	8,914	186	9,800	9,157	643
Court administration	9,250	8,878	372	9,925	9,374	551
Public Administrator	29,070	35,117	(6,047)	26,475	19,823	6,652
Sheriff	421,449	471,160	(49,711)	382,035	376,747	5,288
Jail	300,550	305,509	(4,959)	208,660	275,203	(66,543)
Prosecuting Attorney	130,750	133,468	(2,718)	107,990	104,189	3,801
Juvenile Officer	48,794	40,766	8,028	47,337	46,428	909
County Coroner	16,115	13,542	2,573	12,700	11,621	1,079
Other general county government	157,737	121,507	36,230	152,760	142,183	10,577
Child Support	97,787	97,677	110	82,780	78,279	4,501
Public health and welfare services	250,996	254,216	(3,220)	242,994	214,673	28,321
Emergency Fund	60,079	13,206	46,873	55,657	12,789	42,868
Total Disbursements	2,028,386	2,008,662	19,724	1,900,201	1,825,157	75,044
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	82,693	(16,802)	(99,495)	371	28,499	28,128
CASH, JANUARY 1	55,521	55,521	0	27,022	27,022	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	138,214	38,719	(99,495)	27,393	55,521	28,128

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>SPECIAL ROAD AND BRIDGE FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Property taxes	394,000	347,675	(46,325)	357,500	361,830	4,330
Sales taxes	654,000	627,077	(26,923)	555,000	598,598	43,598
Intergovernmental	775,400	710,144	(65,256)	710,000	861,052	151,052
Charges for services	1,200	2,564	1,364	2,000	1,193	(807)
Interest	61,000	84,557	23,557	71,000	72,450	1,450
Other	1,260	15	(1,245)	500	5,315	4,815
Total Receipts	1,886,860	1,772,032	(114,828)	1,696,000	1,900,438	204,438
DISBURSEMENTS						
Salaries	567,000	526,877	40,123	520,000	476,838	43,162
Employee fringe benefits	137,500	119,013	18,487	126,000	109,840	16,160
Supplies	191,000	172,467	18,533	191,700	157,082	34,618
Insurance	16,000	12,592	3,408	18,000	11,178	6,822
Road and bridge materials	505,000	449,111	55,889	355,000	394,161	(39,161)
Equipment repairs	110,000	71,256	38,744	125,000	123,048	1,952
Rentals	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	0
Equipment purchases	690,000	166,044	523,956	260,000	250,428	9,572
Construction, repair, and maintenance	75,000	34,588	40,412	240,000	51,609	188,391
Other	126,000	123,861	2,139	28,500	0	28,500
Transfers out	36,660	36,660	0	34,000	34,000	0
Total Disbursements	2,459,160	1,712,469	746,691	1,898,200	1,608,184	290,016
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(572,300)	59,563	631,863	(202,200)	292,254	494,454
CASH, JANUARY 1	1,251,305	1,251,305	0	959,051	959,051	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	679,005	1,310,868	631,863	756,851	1,251,305	494,454
<u>ASSESSMENT FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Intergovernmental	146,096	140,833	(5,263)	156,000	161,455	5,455
Interest	3,000	3,444	444	3,500	2,694	(806)
Other	100	57	(43)	100	80	(20)
Charges for services	1,200	1,620	420	2,500	1,171	(1,329)
Total Receipts	150,396	145,954	(4,442)	162,100	165,400	3,300
DISBURSEMENTS						
Assessor	139,996	135,806	4,190	169,293	168,818	475
Total Disbursements	139,996	135,806	4,190	169,293	168,818	475
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	10,400	10,148	(252)	(7,193)	(3,418)	3,775
CASH, JANUARY 1	22,394	22,394	0	25,812	25,812	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	32,794	32,542	(252)	18,619	22,394	3,775

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	6,130	5,377	(753)	4,000	6,138	2,138
Intergovernmental	4,000	2,702	(1,298)	3,300	4,935	1,635
Total Receipts	10,130	8,079	(2,051)	7,300	11,073	3,773
DISBURSEMENTS						
Sheriff	8,000	6,234	1,766	7,600	7,845	(245)
Total Disbursements	8,000	6,234	1,766	7,600	7,845	(245)
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	2,130	1,845	(285)	(300)	3,228	3,528
CASH, JANUARY 1	5,112	5,112	0	1,884	1,884	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	7,242	6,957	(285)	1,584	5,112	3,528
<u>PROSECUTING ATTORNEY TRAINING FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	1,680	1,281	(399)	2,030	1,382	(648)
Intergovernmental	0	0	0	0	143	143
Total Receipts	1,680	1,281	(399)	2,030	1,525	(505)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Prosecuting Attorney	1,900	2,402	(502)	1,750	1,841	(91)
Total Disbursements	1,900	2,402	(502)	1,750	1,841	(91)
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(220)	(1,121)	(901)	280	(316)	(596)
CASH, JANUARY 1	3,089	3,089	0	3,405	3,405	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	2,869	1,968	(901)	3,685	3,089	(596)
<u>ADA CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Sales tax	0	0	0	2,000	3,163	1,163
Interest	3,000	3,866	866	2,500	3,794	1,294
Total Receipts	3,000	3,866	866	4,500	6,957	2,457
DISBURSEMENTS						
Other	26,200	39	26,161	0	1,663	(1,663)
Total Disbursements	26,200	39	26,161	0	1,663	(1,663)
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(23,200)	3,827	27,027	4,500	5,294	794
CASH, JANUARY 1	62,414	62,414	0	57,120	57,120	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	39,214	66,241	27,027	61,620	62,414	794

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>HANDICAP FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Interest	5,000	8,284	3,284	8,000	7,892	(108)
Total Receipts	5,000	8,284	3,284	8,000	7,892	(108)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Building purchase	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000
Total Disbursements	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(95,000)	8,284	103,284	(92,000)	7,892	99,892
CASH, JANUARY 1	133,718	133,718	0	125,826	125,826	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	38,718	142,002	103,284	33,826	133,718	99,892
<u>COURTHOUSE AND JAIL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Sales taxes	100,000	110,661	10,661	90,000	102,472	12,472
Interest	4,000	6,432	2,432	3,000	3,791	791
Total Receipts	104,000	117,093	13,093	93,000	106,263	13,263
DISBURSEMENTS						
Equipment	181,000	98,131	82,869	112,000	40,820	71,180
Total Disbursements	181,000	98,131	82,869	112,000	40,820	71,180
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(77,000)	18,962	95,962	(19,000)	65,443	84,443
CASH, JANUARY 1	105,968	105,968	0	40,525	40,525	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	28,968	124,930	95,962	21,525	105,968	84,443
<u>PROSECUTING ATTORNEY BAD CHECK FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	15,000	9,525	(5,475)	15,000	9,905	(5,095)
Interest	300	303	3	0	289	289
Other	20	41	21	0	15	15
Total Receipts	15,320	9,869	(5,451)	15,000	10,209	(4,791)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Prosecuting Attorney	10,700	13,288	(2,588)	12,000	10,985	1,015
Total Disbursements	10,700	13,288	(2,588)	12,000	10,985	1,015
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	4,620	(3,419)	(8,039)	3,000	(776)	(3,776)
CASH, JANUARY 1	4,945	4,945	0	5,721	5,721	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	9,565	1,526	(8,039)	8,721	4,945	(3,776)

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>PROSECUTING ATTORNEY DELINQUENT TAX FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Interest	80	74	(6)	90	72	(18)
Total Receipts	80	74	(6)	90	72	(18)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Prosecuting Attorney	600	50	550	600	0	600
Total Disbursements	600	50	550	600	0	600
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(520)	24	544	(510)	72	582
CASH, JANUARY 1	1,226	1,226	0	1,154	1,154	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	706	1,250	544	644	1,226	582
<u>RECORDS PRESERVATION FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	13,000	11,408	(1,592)	14,000	12,966	(1,034)
Interest	300	374	74	500	281	(219)
Total Receipts	13,300	11,782	(1,518)	14,500	13,247	(1,253)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Ex Officio Recorder of Deeds	17,600	9,746	7,854	17,050	12,900	4,150
Total Disbursements	17,600	9,746	7,854	17,050	12,900	4,150
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(4,300)	2,036	6,336	(2,550)	347	2,897
CASH, JANUARY 1	5,096	5,096	0	4,749	4,749	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	796	7,132	6,336	2,199	5,096	2,897
<u>LAW ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	11,200	8,428	(2,772)	7,000	8,669	1,669
Total Receipts	11,200	8,428	(2,772)	7,000	8,669	1,669
DISBURSEMENTS						
Sheriff	14,000	7,814	6,186	12,000	11,902	98
Total Disbursements	14,000	7,814	6,186	12,000	11,902	98
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(2,800)	614	3,414	(5,000)	(3,233)	1,767
CASH, JANUARY 1	3,112	3,112	0	6,345	6,345	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	312	3,726	3,414	1,345	3,112	1,767

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>SHERIFF'S SPECIAL FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	50,000	38,237	(11,763)	47,000	51,284	4,284
Interest	1,800	1,023	(777)	1,900	1,849	(51)
Total Receipts	51,800	39,260	(12,540)	48,900	53,133	4,233
DISBURSEMENTS						
Sheriff	10,000	32,537	(22,537)	61,000	84,467	(23,467)
Total Disbursements	10,000	32,537	(22,537)	61,000	84,467	(23,467)
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	41,800	6,723	(35,077)	(12,100)	(31,334)	(19,234)
CASH, JANUARY 1	11,235	11,235	0	42,569	42,569	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	53,035	17,958	(35,077)	30,469	11,235	(19,234)
<u>CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	900	973	73	1,000	896	(104)
Interest	320	319	(1)	400	316	(84)
Total Receipts	1,220	1,292	72	1,400	1,212	(188)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Payments to shelter	4,000	6,000	(2,000)	4,000	0	4,000
Total Disbursements	4,000	6,000	(2,000)	4,000	0	4,000
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(2,780)	(4,708)	(1,928)	(2,600)	1,212	3,812
CASH, JANUARY 1	5,505	5,505	0	4,293	4,293	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	2,725	797	(1,928)	1,693	5,505	3,812
<u>SPECIAL LAW ENFORCEMENT FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	6,000	2,350	(3,650)	9,000	3,792	(5,208)
Interest	700	121	(579)	200	624	424
Total Receipts	6,700	2,471	(4,229)	9,200	4,416	(4,784)
DISBURSEMENTS						
Salaries	9,000	4,900	4,100	18,000	11,124	6,876
Total Disbursements	9,000	4,900	4,100	18,000	11,124	6,876
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(2,300)	(2,429)	(129)	(8,800)	(6,708)	2,092
CASH, JANUARY 1	3,746	3,746	0	10,454	10,454	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	1,446	1,317	(129)	1,654	3,746	2,092

Exhibit B

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN CASH - BUDGET AND ACTUAL - VARIOUS FUNDS

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2000			1999		
	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>EMERGENCY 911 FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Sales tax	371,019	366,960	(4,059)	285,577	350,947	65,370
Interest	0	3,097	3,097	3,000	2,720	(280)
Other	0	2,602	2,602	0	8,828	8,828
Total Receipts	371,019	372,659	1,640	288,577	362,495	73,918
DISBURSEMENTS						
Salaries	133,423	148,775	(15,352)	156,756	141,538	15,218
Employee fringe benefits	19,850	16,699	3,151	25,000	18,242	6,758
Program expense	116,636	162,618	(45,982)	82,640	133,917	(51,277)
Equipment	43,000	8,360	34,640	68,300	0	68,300
Repairs	6,500	910	5,590	0	7,570	(7,570)
Insurance	11,800	10,461	1,339	10,000	9,027	973
Miscellaneous	18,395	10,223	8,172	35,120	14,002	21,118
Tax anticipation note	0	0	0	5,000	95,000	(90,000)
Total Disbursements	349,604	358,046	(8,442)	382,816	419,296	(36,480)
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	21,415	14,613	(6,802)	(94,239)	(56,801)	37,438
CASH, JANUARY 1	97,716	97,716	0	154,517	154,517	0
CASH, DECEMBER 31	119,131	112,329	(6,802)	60,278	97,716	37,438
<u>FAMILY ACCESS FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Charges for services	1,000	30	(970)			
Interest	10	60	50			
Total Receipts	1,010	90	(920)			
DISBURSEMENTS						
Other	0	0	0			
Total Disbursements	0	0	0			
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	1,010	90	(920)			
CASH, JANUARY 1	951	951	0			
CASH, DECEMBER 31	1,961	1,041	(920)			
<u>MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION FUND</u>						
RECEIPTS						
Intergovernmental	0	0	0			
Total Receipts	0	0	0			
DISBURSEMENTS						
Bird's Nest Access project	15,711	7,981	7,730			
Total Disbursements	15,711	7,981	7,730			
RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(15,711)	(7,981)	7,730			
CASH, JANUARY 1	15,711	15,711	0			
CASH, DECEMBER 31	\$ 0	7,730	7,730			

The accompanying Notes to the Financial Statements are an integral part of this statement.

Notes to the Financial Statements

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Reporting Entity and Basis of Presentation

The accompanying special-purpose financial statements present the receipts, disbursements, and changes in cash of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, and comparisons of such information with the corresponding budgeted information for various funds of the county. The funds presented are established under statutory or administrative authority, and their operations are under the control of the County Commission, an elected county official, the Senior Citizens Service Board or the Emergency 911(E911) Board. The General Revenue Fund is the county's general operating fund, accounting for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund. The other funds presented account for financial resources whose use is restricted for specified purposes.

B. Basis of Accounting

The financial statements are prepared on the cash basis of accounting; accordingly, amounts are recognized when received or disbursed in cash. This basis of accounting differs from accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, which require revenues to be recognized when they become available and measurable or when they are earned and expenditures or expenses to be recognized when the related liabilities are incurred.

C. Budgets and Budgetary Practices

The County Commission and other applicable boards are responsible for the preparation and approval of budgets for various county funds in accordance with Sections 50.525 through 50.745, RSMo 2000, the county budget law. These budgets are adopted on the cash basis of accounting.

Although adoption of a formal budget is required by law, the county did not adopt formal budgets for the following funds:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Years Ended December 31,</u>
Circuit Clerk Interest Fund	2000 and 1999
Associate Circuit Interest Fund	2000 and 1999
Law Library Fund	2000 and 1999
Election Service Fund	2000
Senior Citizens Service Fund	2000
Family Access Fund	1999
Missouri Department of Conservation Fund	1999

Warrants issued were in excess of budgeted amounts for the following funds:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Years Ended December 31,</u>
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund	2000 and 1999
Sheriff's Special Fund	2000 and 1999
Emergency 911 Fund	2000 and 1999
Prosecuting Attorney Bad Check Fund	2000
Children's Trust Fund	2000
Law Enforcement Training Fund	1999
ADA Capital Improvement Fund	1999

Section 50.740, RSMo 2000, prohibits expenditures in excess of the approved budgets.

D. Published Financial Statements

Under Sections 50.800 and 50.810, RSMo 2000, the County Commission is responsible for preparing and publishing in a local newspaper a detailed annual financial statement for the county. The financial statement is required to show receipts or revenues, disbursements or expenditures, and beginning and ending balances for each fund.

However, the county's published financial statements did not include the following funds:

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Years Ended December 31,</u>
Circuit Clerk Interest Fund	2000 and 1999
Associate Circuit Interest Fund	2000 and 1999
Law Library Fund	2000 and 1999
Handicap Fund	1999
Prosecuting Attorney Delinquent Tax Fund	1999
Children's Trust Fund	1999
Family Access Fund	1999

2. Cash

Section 110.270, RSMo 2000, based on Article IV, Section 15, Missouri Constitution, authorizes counties to place their funds, either outright or by repurchase agreement, in U.S. Treasury and agency obligations. In addition, Section 30.950, RSMo 2000, requires political subdivisions with authority to invest in instruments other than depositary accounts at financial institutions to adopt a written investment policy. Among other things, the policy is to commit a political subdivision to the principles of safety, liquidity, and yield (in that order) when managing public funds and to prohibit purchase of derivatives (either directly or through repurchase agreements), use of leveraging (through either reverse repurchase agreements or other methods), and use of public funds for speculation. The county has not adopted such a policy.

In accordance with Statement No. 3 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, *Deposits with Financial Institutions, Investments (Including Repurchase Agreements), and Reverse Repurchase Agreements*, disclosures are provided below regarding the risk of potential loss of cash deposits. For the purposes of these disclosures, deposits with financial institutions are demand, time, and savings accounts, including certificates of deposit and negotiable order of withdrawal accounts, in banks, savings institutions, and credit unions.

The county's deposits at December 31, 2000 and 1999, were entirely covered by federal depositary insurance or by collateral securities held by the county's custodial bank in the county's name.

However, because of significantly higher bank balances at certain times during the year, uninsured and uncollateralized balances existed at those times although not at year-end.

The E911 Board's deposits at December 31, 2000 and 1999, were entirely covered by federal depositary insurance or by collateral securities held by the E911 Board's custodial bank in the E911 Board's name.

The Senior Citizens Service Board's deposits at December 31, 2000, were entirely covered by federal depositary insurance or by collateral securities held by the Senior Citizens Service Board's custodial bank in the Senior Citizens Service Board's name.

To protect the safety of county deposits, Section 110.020, RSMo 2000, requires depositaries to pledge collateral securities to secure county deposits not insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Supplementary Schedule

Schedule

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

Federal CFDA Number	Federal Grantor/Pass-Through Grantor/Program Title	Pass-Through Entity Identifying Number	Federal Expenditures	
			Year Ended December 31,	
			2000	1999
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Passed through state:				
Department of Health -				
10.557	Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	ERO045-9127 ERO045-0127 ERO045-1127	\$ 0 43,664 13,125	49,900 16,288 0
	Program Total		<u>56,789</u>	<u>66,188</u>
Office of Administration -				
10.665	Schools and Roads - Grants to States	N/A	71,229	77,955
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
Direct programs:				
16.710	Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Grants	N/A	9,065	33,469
16.unknown	Equitable Sharing of Seized and Forfeited Property	98-DEA-351744	0	8,782
Passed through state:				
Department of Public Safety -				
16.540	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	98-JFJ7-38 99-JFJ4-51	0 7,793	15,117 5,058
	Program Total		<u>7,793</u>	<u>20,175</u>
16.575	Crime Victim Assistance	99-SSVF-0021 2000-SSVF-0019	0 6,967	15,144 5,419
	Program Total		<u>6,967</u>	<u>20,563</u>
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Passed through state:				
Highway and Transportation Commission -				
20.205	Highway Planning and Construction	BRO-028	0	168,533
State Emergency Management Agency -				
20.703	Hazardous Material Emergency Preparedness	N/A	1,955	0

Schedule

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

Federal CFDA Number	Federal Grantor/Pass-Through Grantor/Program Title	Pass-Through Entity Identifying Number	Federal Expenditures	
			Year Ended December 31,	
			2000	1999
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES				
Direct program-				
93.268	Immunization Grants	N/A	1,114	2,125
Passed through state:				
Department of Health -				
93.197	Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Projects - State and Local Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention and Surveillance of Blood Lead Levels in Children	ERO146-9127CLPP ERO146-0127CLPP	0 56	220 0
	Program Total		<u>56</u>	<u>220</u>
93.268	Immunization Grants	N/A	26,843	17,313
Department of Social Services -				
93.563	Child Support Enforcement	N/A	62,694	55,790
Department of Health -				
93.575	Child Care and Development Block Grant	ERO146-9127 ERO146-0127	0 2,198	2,040 303
	Program Total		<u>2,198</u>	<u>2,343</u>
93.919	Cooperative Agreements for State-Based Comprehensive Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Programs	ERO161-9 ERO161-0 ERO161-1	0 6,991 693	4,679 2,292 0
	Program Total		<u>7,684</u>	<u>6,971</u>
93.940	HIV Prevention Activities - Health Department Based	N/A	24	21
93.991	Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant	N/A	320	188

Schedule

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

Federal CFDA Number	Federal Grantor/Pass-Through Grantor/Program Title	Pass-Through Entity Identifying Number	Federal Expenditures	
			Year Ended December 31,	
			2000	1999
93.994	Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant to the States	ERO146-9127	0	14,598
		ERO146-0127	14,691	4,120
		ERO146-1127	2,005	0
		ERO146-9127FP	0	2,768
		ERO146-0127FP	2,295	608
		ERO146-1127FP	574	0
		N/A	1,598	938
	Program Total		<u>21,163</u>	<u>23,032</u>
	Total Expenditures of Federal Awards		\$ <u><u>275,894</u></u>	<u><u>503,668</u></u>

N/A - Not applicable

The accompanying Notes to the Supplementary Schedule are an integral part of this schedule.

Notes to the Supplementary Schedule

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
NOTES TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE

1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Purpose of Schedule and Reporting Entity

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards has been prepared to comply with the requirements of OMB Circular A-133. This circular requires a schedule that provides total federal awards expended for each federal program and the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number or other identifying number when the CFDA information is not available.

The schedule includes all federal awards administered by Crawford County, Missouri.

B. Basis of Presentation

OMB Circular A-133 includes these definitions, which govern the contents of the schedule:

Federal financial assistance means assistance that non-Federal entities receive or administer in the form of grants, loans, loan guarantees, property (including donated surplus property), cooperative agreements, interest subsidies, insurance, food commodities, direct appropriations, and other assistance, but does not include amounts received as reimbursement for services rendered to individuals

Federal award means Federal financial assistance and Federal cost-reimbursement contracts that non-Federal entities receive directly from Federal awarding agencies or indirectly from pass-through entities. It does not include procurement contracts, under grants or contracts, used to buy goods or services from vendors.

Accordingly, the schedule includes expenditures of both cash and noncash awards.

C. Basis of Accounting

Except as noted below, the schedule is presented on the cash basis of accounting, which recognizes amounts only when disbursed in cash.

Of the amounts for Immunization Grants (CFDA number 93.268), \$26,843 and \$15,753 represent the original acquisition cost of vaccines purchased by the Centers for Disease Control of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services but distributed to the Health Center through the state Department of Health during the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999. Of the amounts for the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant (CFDA number 93.991), \$320 and \$188 represent the original acquisition cost of vaccines received by the Health Center through the state Department of Health during the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999. Of the amounts for the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant to the States (CFDA number 93.994), \$1598 and \$938 also represent the original acquisition cost of vaccines received by the Health Center through the state Department of Health during the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999. The remaining amounts for Immunization Grants and the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant to the States represent cash disbursements.

2. Subrecipients

The county provided no federal awards to subrecipients during the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999.

FEDERAL AWARDS -
SINGLE AUDIT SECTION

State Auditor's Report



CLAIRE C. McCASKILL
Missouri State Auditor

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH
REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO EACH MAJOR PROGRAM AND ON INTERNAL
CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133

To the County Commission
and
Officeholders of Crawford County, Missouri

Compliance

We have audited the compliance of Crawford County, Missouri, with the types of compliance requirements described in the *U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* that are applicable to each of its major federal programs for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999. The county's major federal programs are identified in the summary of auditor's results section of the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to each of its major federal programs is the responsibility of the county's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the county's compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the county's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of the county's compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, Crawford County, Missouri, complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred to above that are applicable to each of its major federal programs for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999.

Internal Control Over Compliance

The management of Crawford County, Missouri, is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to federal programs. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the county's internal control over compliance with requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance and to test and report on the internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133.

Our consideration of the internal control over compliance would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be material weaknesses. A material weakness is a condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that noncompliance with the applicable requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants that would be material in relation to a major federal program being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. We noted no matters involving the internal control over compliance and its operation that we consider to be material weaknesses.

This report is intended for the information of the management of Crawford County, Missouri; federal awarding agencies and pass-through entities; and other applicable government officials. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.



Claire McCaskill
State Auditor

June 28, 2001 (fieldwork completion date)

Schedule

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
 SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS
 (INCLUDING MANAGEMENT'S PLAN FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION)
 YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000 AND 1999

Section I - Summary of Auditor's Results

Financial Statements

Type of auditor's report issued: Unqualified

Internal control over financial reporting:

Material weaknesses identified? yes x no

Reportable conditions identified that are not considered to be material weaknesses? yes x none reported

Noncompliance material to the financial statements noted? yes x no

Federal Awards

Internal control over major programs:

Material weaknesses identified? yes x no

Reportable conditions identified that are not considered to be material weaknesses? yes x none reported

Type of auditor's report issued on compliance for major programs: Unqualified

Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with Section .510(a) of OMB Circular A-133? yes x no

Identification of major programs:

<u>CFDA or Other Identifying Number</u>	<u>Program Title</u>
10.665	Schools and Roads-Grants to States
20.205	Highway Planning and Construction
93.563	Child Support Enforcement

Dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs:

\$300,000

Auditee qualified as a low-risk auditee?

_____ yes x no

Section II - Financial Statement Findings

This section includes no audit findings that *Government Auditing Standards* requires to be reported for an audit of financial statements.

Section III - Federal Award Findings and Questioned Costs

This section includes no audit findings that Section .510(a) of OMB Circular A-133 requires to be reported for an audit of federal awards.

Follow-Up on Prior Audit Findings for an
Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance
With *Government Auditing Standards*

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
FOLLOW-UP ON PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS FOR AN
AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE
WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS*

Our prior audit report issued for the two years ended December 31, 1998, included no audit findings that *Government Auditing Standards* requires to be reported for an audit of financial statements.

Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings
in Accordance With OMB Circular A-133

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS
IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133

Section .315 of OMB Circular A-133 requires the auditee to prepare a Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings to report the status of all findings that are relative to federal awards and included in the prior audit report's Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. The summary schedule also must include findings reported in the prior audit's Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings, except those listed as corrected, no longer valid, or not warranting further action.

Section .500(e) of OMB Circular A-133 requires the auditor to follow up on these prior audit findings; to perform procedures to assess the reasonableness of the Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings; and to report, as a current year finding, when the auditor concludes that the schedule materially misrepresents the status of any prior findings.

Our prior audit report issued for the two years ended December 31, 1998, included no audit findings that Section .510(a) of OMB Circular A-133 requires to be reported for an audit of federal awards.

MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT SECTION

Management Advisory Report -
State Auditor's Findings

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY REPORT -
STATE AUDITOR'S FINDINGS

We have audited the special-purpose financial statements of various funds of Crawford County, Missouri, as of and for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999, and have issued our report thereon dated June 28, 2001. We also have audited the compliance of Crawford County, Missouri, with the types of compliance requirements described in the *U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement* that are applicable to each of its major federal programs for the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999, and have issued our report thereon dated June 28, 2001.

We also have audited the operations of elected officials with funds other than those presented in the special-purpose financial statements. As applicable, the objectives of this audit were to:

1. Determine the internal controls established over the transactions of the various county officials.
2. Review and evaluate certain other management practices for efficiency and effectiveness.
3. Review certain management practices and financial information for compliance with applicable constitutional, statutory, or contractual provisions.

Our audit was conducted in accordance with applicable standards contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and included such procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. In this regard, we reviewed accounting and bank records and other pertinent documents and interviewed various personnel of the county officials.

As part of our audit, we assessed the controls of the various county officials to the extent we determined necessary to evaluate the specific matters described above and not to provide assurance on those controls. With respect to controls, we obtained an understanding of the design of relevant policies and procedures and whether they have been placed in operation and we assessed control risk.

Because the Senate Bill 40 Board is audited and separately reported on by other independent auditors, the related fund is not presented in the special-purpose financial statements. However, we reviewed that audit report and other applicable information.

Our audit was limited to the specific matters described in the preceding paragraphs and was based on selective tests and procedures considered appropriate in the circumstances. Had we performed additional procedures, other information might have come to our attention that would have been included in this report.

The accompanying Management Advisory Report presents our findings arising from our audit of the elected county officials referred to above. In addition, this report includes findings other than those, if any, reported in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. These findings resulted from our audit of the special-purpose financial statements of Crawford County and of its compliance with the types of compliance requirements applicable to each of its major federal

programs but do not meet the criteria for inclusion in the written reports on compliance and on internal control over financial reporting or compliance that are required for audits performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*.

1.	County Procedures
-----------	--------------------------

- A.1. Bids were not always solicited, nor was bid documentation always retained for various purchases made by the county during the audit period. Examples of items purchased for which bids were not solicited or adequate documentation could not be located were as follows:

Rock Base	\$11,012
Mower parts	7,770
M-30 Oil	14,400

The County bids all rock purchases once each year. For the purchase indicated above, the rock was purchased from a vendor other than the company which was awarded the bid. In addition, the price paid for the rock was higher than the contracted amount. No documentation was retained as to why the county did not purchase from the county’s contracted vendor.

2. The County Commission paid \$92,535 for a paving project which was not awarded to the low bidder. Due to a miscommunication regarding the materials to be used, the paving project was bid twice and the same company was the low bidder each time. In the minutes the County Commission indicated that they awarded the contract to the high bidder because the firm was located in the county. While the county believes the reason given was a valid justification to meet the criteria of “lowest and best” bid, the county paid an additional \$8,000 on this project because they did not select the low bidder.

Section 50.660, RSMo 2000, requires the advertisement for bids for all purchases of \$4,500 or more, from any one person, firm, or corporation during any period of ninety days.

Bidding procedures for major purchases provide a framework for economical management of county resources and help assure the county that it receives fair value by contracting with the lowest and best bidders. In addition, competitive bidding ensures all parties are given an equal opportunity to participate in county business. Documentation of bids should include, at a minimum, a listing of vendors from whom bids were requested, a copy of the request proposal, newspaper publication notices when available, bids received, the basis and justification for awarding bids, and documentation of all discussions with vendors.

- B. In September and October 2000, the county purchased two separate pieces of land for additional storage space for road and bridge equipment. The county did not obtain an independent appraisal to value the properties prior to the purchases and apparently negotiated with the owners for the final purchase prices. The county's records show that the county paid approximately \$6,700 and \$15,200, respectively, for the two pieces of land. The County Commission indicated that these particular pieces of land were needed because they were adjacent to the current road and bridge shed, but there was no documentation of the selection process used to identify other available pieces of property which might have met the county's needs.

Independent appraisals as well as documentation of the selection process and price negotiations are necessary to ensure that fair prices are paid and all alternatives are considered. Complete justification for the selection process should be thoroughly documented.

- C. The County Commission has not received reimbursement for an invoice of approximately \$5,055 which was paid on February 7, 2000. During the two years ended December 31, 2000, the county received reimbursements from the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) for bridge rehabilitation expenditures under the Highway Planning and Construction program; however, the county did not ensure all the reimbursements were claimed. Apparently a reimbursement claim for the expenditure had been sent back to the county due to a mathematical error. However, the required information was not returned to MoDOT and no one followed up to ensure all claims were submitted and paid. When we brought this matter to the attention of the County Clerk, she contacted MoDOT. However, as of June 28, 2001, the county still had not received notification whether MoDOT will pay the late claim.

To maximize revenues, the County Commission should ensure that procedures are in place to monitor reimbursements. In addition, discrepancies between reimbursements claimed and amounts received must be investigated and resolved in a timely manner. The county should continue to seek reimbursement for the \$5,055 from MoDOT.

- D. The county has not sufficiently reduced its general revenue property tax levy to reduce property tax revenues by 50 percent of sales tax revenues as provided in the ballot issue passed by Crawford County voters under the provisions of Section 67.505, RSMo 2000.

Following are the calculations of the property tax rollback and sales tax collections for the two years ended December 31, 2000, and excess property taxes of prior years:

	Year Ended December 31,	
	2000	1999
ACTUAL SALES TAX REVENUES	\$ 797,469	734,433
Required percentage of revenue reduction	X 50%	50%
Required property tax revenue reduction	398,735	367,217
Assessed Valuation	165,938,922	157,157,401
General Revenue Fund tax levy reduction (per \$100 of assessed valuation)	X 0.2315	0.2300
Actual property tax revenue reduction	384,149	361,462
EXCESS PROPERTY TAX REVENUES COLLECTED	14,586	5,755
Excess property tax revenue collections from prior years	21,312	15,557
NET EXCESS	\$ 35,898	21,312

The County Clerk considered the under-reduction from 1998 when calculating the roll back for 1999 but did not consider the cumulative effect of other prior years. In addition, the County Clerk did not consider the effect of any prior years in calculating the roll back for 2000. These procedural errors, together with actual sales tax collections exceeding estimated amounts has resulted in the county having collected excess property tax revenues. When calculating the General Revenue Fund property tax levy in August 2001, the county included a reduction of \$5,000 to begin addressing the excess prior collections. Additional reductions will need to be made in future years to the property tax levy to fully adjust for the \$35,898 excess property taxes collected in prior years.

Section 67.505.3, RSMo 2000, provides budgeted property taxes are to be reduced by voter-approved percentages of sales tax revenue. This section also provides for actual sales tax revenue of the preceding year that is over or under that year's estimated sales tax revenue to be reflected in the subsequent year's property tax revenues roll back calculation.

WE RECOMMEND the County Commission:

- A. Solicit bids for all items in accordance with state law. Documentation of bids solicited and justification of bid awards should be maintained by the County Clerk. If bids cannot be obtained and sole source procurement is necessary, the County Commission minutes should reflect the circumstances.
- B. Ensure justification of the selection process is thoroughly documented and an independent appraisal is obtained for future land purchases.

- C. Ensure procedures are in place to monitor reimbursements due to the County and investigate and resolve reimbursements not received on a timely basis.
- D. Ensure appropriate adjustments are made to the levy in the future to reflect excess property taxes collected in prior years.

AUDITEE’S RESPONSE

- A. *The County Commission indicated they agree with the recommendation and that it is their policy to bid purchases as required by statute. They indicated they will try harder in the future to ensure bidding is done when needed. They also indicated they will better document extenuating circumstances and justifications for bid awards as applicable.*
- B. *The County Commission indicated they agree with the recommendation and will better document the selection process for any future land purchases. In addition, they indicated they would consider obtaining independent appraisals and will also check with the County Assessor regarding the reasonableness of the purchase price for future land purchases.*
- C. *The County Commission indicated they agree with the recommendation. The County Clerk stated that she will continue to follow-up on the unpaid reimbursement with MoDOT. She also stated she would set up a system to track and monitor receivables on future projects.*
- D. *The County Commission and County Clerk indicated they agree with the recommendation. They stated that, as noted in the finding, they have adjusted the current tax levy to address some of the prior excess collections. They indicated that due to a large strain on the General Revenue Fund this year, they did not believe they could reduce the levy any further for the current year, but they plan to address the remaining excess collections when calculating the tax levy in future years.*

2.	Salaries and Fringe Benefits
-----------	-------------------------------------

- A. Section 50.333.13, RSMo, enacted in 1997, allowed salary commissions meeting in 1997 to provide mid-term salary increases for associate county commissioners elected in 1996. The motivation behind this amendment was the fact that associate county commissioners’ terms had been increased from two years to four years. Based on this statute, in 1999 Crawford County’s Associate County Commissioners salaries were each increased approximately \$5,000 yearly, according to information from the County Clerk.

On May 15, 2001, the Missouri Supreme Court handed down an opinion in a case that challenged the validity of that statute. The Supreme Court held that this section of statute violated Article VII, section 13 of the Missouri Constitution, which specifically prohibits an increase in compensation for state, county and municipal officers during the term of office. This case, *Laclede County v. Douglass et al.*, holds that all raises given pursuant to this statute section are unconstitutional.

Based upon the Supreme Court decision, the raises given to each of the Associate County Commissioners, totaling approximately \$10,000 for the two years ended December 31, 2000, should be repaid. In addition, in light of the ruling, any raises given to other officials within their term of office should be re-evaluated for propriety.

- B. The County has separated its road and bridge operation into two districts, with separate staff and records for each. Both districts' foremen and one mechanic are provided county-owned vehicles. The County Commission indicated the road and bridge foremen are on-call 24 hours a day due to possible emergency situations and the mechanic has his personal tools in the county vehicle; however, there is no written policy allowing the use of these vehicles for commuting purposes. The Presiding Commissioner and County Clerk estimated that each of the three employees commutes approximately 20 miles roundtrip daily in the county-owned vehicles.

IRS reporting guidelines indicate personal commuting mileage is a reportable fringe benefit. Furthermore, IRS guidelines require the full value of the provided vehicle to be reported if the employer does not require the submission of detailed logs that distinguish between business and personal usage. The county does not require such usage logs.

Procedures have not been established to ensure the IRS guidelines are followed. As a result, the county may be subject to penalties and/or fines for failure to report all taxable benefits.

The above condition was noted in two previous audit reports. In their response to the prior report, the County Commission indicated that a written policy specifying when county employees would be required to drive county owned vehicles to and from work would be developed. However, such a written policy has still not been developed at this time.

WE RECOMMEND the County Commission:

- A. Review the impact of this decision and develop a plan for obtaining repayment of the salary overpayments.
- B. Comply with IRS guidelines for the reporting of fringe benefits relating to county-owned vehicles. In addition, the county should establish a written policy for road and bridge employees regarding appropriate use of county vehicles for commuting purposes.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

- A. *The County Commission indicated they plan to rely on guidance from the Prosecuting Attorney regarding the ruling concerning the Associate Commissioners' salaries. They also indicated that the Prosecuting Attorney has been asked to submit a request to the Office of*

Attorney General for an opinion on whether the monies are required to be paid back. The commission indicated they plan to take no further action until they have received such guidance.

- B. *The County Commission indicated that as of early 2001, the mechanic is no longer allowed to take the county vehicle home. The County Commission indicated they agree with the recommendation and they will develop a formal policy requiring the foremen to take the county vehicles home since they are considered to be on-call 24 hours per day. The County Commission plans to develop this policy immediately.*

3. Financial Reporting

- A. The financial statement for the year ended December 31, 1999 was not published until January 17, 2001. The County Clerk stated that the financial statement was not published because of problems caused by the conversion to a new computerized accounting system in March 1999. The County Clerk's and Treasurer's records did not balance at year-end due to these conversion errors and the County Clerk had to recalculate the amounts manually to prepare an accurate financial statement for publication. However, these recalculations were not performed timely.

Section 50.800, RSMo 2000, requires the county to prepare and publish financial statements on or before the first Monday in March of each year. The publishing of complete and timely financial statements, besides meeting statutory requirements, will provide information to citizens as to the operations of their county government and how tax dollars are spent.

A similar condition was noted in our prior report.

- B. The published annual financial statements did not include the activity of some county funds as required. Section 50.800, RSMo 2000, requires that the financial statements show receipts or revenues, and disbursements or expenditures, and beginning and ending balances for all county funds. In addition, for the Emergency 911 Fund and the Senate Bill 40 Board Fund, the published financial statements showed only the amounts passed through the County Treasurer. For the published financial statements to adequately inform the citizens of the county's financial activities, all monies received and disbursed by the county should be included.
- C. Section .310(b) of Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-profit Organizations*, requires the auditee to prepare a schedule of expenditures of federal awards (SEFA) for the period covered by the auditee's financial statements. The county is required to submit the SEFA to the State Auditor's Office as part of the annual budget.

The county does not have procedures in place to adequately track federal awards for preparation of the SEFA. The SEFA prepared for the two years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999, contained some errors and omissions. For example, expenditures

relating to a few federal grants were reported incorrectly or not included on the schedules. The programs reported did not include the required pass-through grantor's number. In addition, some non-federal funds were included.

For the SEFA to adequately reflect the county's federal financial assistance expenditures, it is necessary that all federal financial expenditures be properly reported. Without an accurate SEFA, federal financial activity may not be audited and reported in accordance with federal audit requirements which could result in future reductions of federal awards.

WE RECOMMEND the County Commission:

- A. Publish financial statements timely as required by state law.
- B. Ensure information for all county funds is properly included in the annual published financial statements.
- C. Ensure that the County Clerk prepares a complete and accurate schedule of expenditures of federal awards to submit to the State Auditor's Office as part of the annual budget.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

- A. *The County Clerk agrees with the recommendation and stated she would attempt to publish the financial statements more timely in the future.*
- B. *The County Clerk agrees with the recommendation and stated that she would attempt to obtain the needed information from the various applicable officials and county boards for inclusion in the published financial statements in the future.*
- C. *The County Clerk agrees with the recommendation and stated she will work more closely with the Nursing Service and other county officials to track and report federal expenditures more accurately when preparing the next schedule of expenditures of federal awards.*

4. Fixed Assets

The County Commission or its designee is responsible for maintaining a complete detailed record of county property. In the past, the County Clerk has been primarily responsible for these records. Our review of the fixed asset records and procedures revealed the following concerns:

- A. The County Clerk maintains a computerized inventory listing of fixed assets held by county officials; however, additions are not added to fixed asset records as they occur. In addition, the County Clerk does not periodically reconcile equipment purchases with additions to the fixed asset records. During our review of county

expenditures, we noted several fixed assets which were purchased but were not added to the listing. Performing this reconciliation would ensure all purchases have been added to fixed asset records.

- B. The county does not have formal procedures for disposing of county owned property. Written authorization is not consistently obtained from the County Commission. Currently, when an item is no longer needed or useful, the officeholder or department head will dispose of the property or place the item in storage without getting written approval from the County Commission. As a result, the County Commission and the County Clerk are not always aware of the disposal and may not remove the item from the fixed asset records.

Written authorization for the disposal of property is necessary to lessen the possibility of misuse and to provide adequate support for changes to the fixed asset records.

Adequate general fixed asset records are necessary to meet statutory requirements, secure better internal control over county property, and provide a basis for determining proper insurance coverage for county property.

Effective August 28, 1999, Section 49.093, RSMo 2000, provides the county officer of each county department shall annually inspect and inventory county property used by that department with an individual value of \$250 or more and any property with an aggregate original value of \$1,000 or more. After the first inventory is taken, an explanation of material changes shall be attached to subsequent inventories. All remaining property not inventoried by a particular department shall be inventoried by the county clerk. The reports required by this section shall be signed by the county clerk.

Similar conditions were noted in two previous audit reports.

WE RECOMMEND the County Commission establish a written policy related to the handling and accounting for fixed assets. Besides providing guidance on accounting and record keeping, the policy could include necessary definitions, address important dates, establish standardized forms and reports to be used, discuss procedures for the handling of asset disposition, and any other concerns associated with county property.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

The County Commission indicated they agree with the recommendation and that they plan to develop a written policy for fixed assets by January 2002. The County Clerk stated her office is now trying to monitor invoices for fixed asset purchases to ensure applicable assets are added to the inventory listing as the items are received.

The county's assessment lists and tax books are maintained on a computerized property tax system. The County Assessor inputs the assessed valuation data, the County Clerk inputs the tax rates, extends and prints the tax books, and the County Collector collects the taxes. In our review of controls relating to the property tax computer system, we noted the following concerns:

- A. The County Clerk does not maintain an account book with the County Collector. An account book would summarize all taxes being charged to the County Collector, monthly collections, delinquent credits, abatements and additions, and protested amounts by tax book. These amounts could then be verified by the County Clerk from aggregate abstracts, tax books, court orders, monthly collection reports, and totals of all charges and credits. A complete account book would help the County Clerk ensure that the amount of taxes charged and credited to the County Collector each year is complete and accurate and could also be used by the County Commission to verify the Collector's annual settlement.

Some of these records and controls are also required by various sections of state law, which are intended to establish some checks and balances related to the collection of property taxes. It is apparent that the County Clerk and the County Commission have not verified the County Collector's annual settlements since, as noted in MAR 6.A., the County Collector has not filed an annual settlement for the last three tax years ending February 28, 2001.

- B. The County Assessor's office is responsible for entering property tax addition and abatement information into the property tax system. However, the County Collector can also make changes to the tax records, as well as posting manual changes directly to the printed tax books. While a listing of additions and abatements is printed and submitted to the County Clerk's office for the County Commissioners' approval, there is no independent and subsequent comparison of additions and abatements approved by the County Commission to actual changes to the property tax books.

Section 137.260, RSMo 2000, requires that the tax book only be changed by the clerk of the county commission under order of the county commission. Controls should be established so that the County Clerk maintains a file of all additions and abatements that are provided to the County Collector by the County Assessor and periodically reconciles this information to changes made to the property tax data.

- C. Passwords and other procedures are not in place to limit access to the various property tax data files and programs utilized by the County Assessor and County Collector. The County Assessor's and County Collector's personnel have access to programs and data files of the property tax system. Lack of such passwords and procedures provides the potential for personnel to make undetected and unauthorized changes to information.

To establish individual responsibility, as well as help preserve the integrity of computer programs and data files, access to information should be limited to authorized individuals. A system of passwords and other procedures can be used to properly restrict access. A unique password should be assigned to each user of a system, and these passwords should be kept confidential and changed periodically to help limit the effect of unauthorized access to computer files.

WE AGAIN RECOMMEND:

- A. The County Clerk appropriately maintain her account book with the County Collector and the County Commission use it to verify the County Collector's annual settlement.
- B. The County Commission or County Clerk establish procedures to agree approved addition and abatement orders with related changes made to the property tax data.
- C. The County Commission consult with their programmer and establish procedures to restrict access to computer files, including the use of unique passwords, to authorized individuals.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

- A. *The County Clerk indicated she agrees with the recommendation and will work to prepare an account book that she and the County Commission can use to verify the County Collector's future annual settlements.*
- B. *The County Commission indicated they agree with the recommendation and would like to develop a process where they can give prior approval to such changes. They stated they will discuss the issue with the County Collector and the County Assessor in order to establish better procedures for approving additions and abatements. The County Commission stated they will implement this recommendation by January 2002.*
- C. *The County Commission indicated they agree this recommendation should be implemented. They stated they will work with the county's programmer, the County Collector, and the County Assessor to establish password controls by January 2002.*

6. County Collector's Accounting Controls and Procedures

The County Collector is responsible for collecting and distributing property taxes for most political subdivisions within the county. During the years ended February 28, 2001 and 2000, the County Collector collected property taxes totaling approximately \$8.0 million and \$7.8 million, respectively. During our review, we noted the following concerns:

- A. The County Collector is required by Section 139.160, RSMo 2000, to file an annual settlement with the County Clerk by the first Monday in March of each year. The County Collector has not prepared or filed annual settlements for the years ended February 28(29) 2001, 2000, and 1999, with the County Commission. A draft of the

settlement for the year ended February 28, 2001 was prepared upon our request in April 2001. We noted that various amounts on the draft were inaccurate and did not agree to the tax books, some activity was not included, and the draft settlement did not balance.

In order for the County Clerk and County Commission to properly verify the various tax books and tax collections, it is imperative the County Collector file annual settlements on a timely basis. In addition, timely annual settlements are an essential part of the checks and balances system established by state law.

- B.1. The County Collector does not reconcile monies collected to paid tax receipts, daily abstracted report of collections or deposits in the bank account. The Collector records the total monies received each day in a notebook, which the Deputy Collector then reconciles to the daily abstracted report of collections. However, the Collector does not attempt to reconcile the daily abstracted report of collections or the amounts recorded in the notebook to the actual paid tax receipts or to the deposits in the bank account. As a result, the County Collector's deposits into the bank account do not always agree to the total of the tax collections for that day.
- 2. In addition, the County Collector does not perform adequate monthly reconciliations between the amounts in his bank account, various liabilities, and other reconciling items to which the cash balance relates. The County Collector prepares monthly bank reconciliations; however, sometimes the reconciled bank balance does not agree to the checkbook balance or liabilities and the County Collector does not investigate or attempt to explain the differences. For example, the reconciled bank balance at February 28, 2001 totaled approximately \$1,121,500 while identified liabilities totaled approximately \$1,123,000.

Proper internal control procedures would include reconciling the paid tax receipts to the daily abstracted report of collections and to deposits in the bank account. Any differences should be fully investigated and explained on the reconciliation. Without performing this reconciliation, the County Collector has no assurance that all monies received are deposited in the bank account or that all payments were properly recorded in the computer system. In addition, adequate monthly reconciliations are necessary to ensure that all receipts and disbursements are properly accounted for and that the cash balance can be properly identified to appropriate liabilities and other reconciling items.

This condition was noted in our prior report.

- C. As previously reported, while the County Collector deposits receipts in the bank account daily, he does not deposit the receipts intact. The change fund is not maintained at a set amount, some cash receipts are used to make small refunds, and some tax bills are credited with full payment even when the amount received is a few dollars less than the amount due. Along with the lack of reconciliations described in part B1 above, the failure to deposit receipts intact makes it difficult to ensure all monies collected have been deposited.

To adequately safeguard against theft or misuse of funds and to provide assurance over assets, all receipts should be deposited intact daily.

This condition was noted in two previous audit reports.

- D. The County Collector holds his funds at a different bank than the county's depository bank. The County Collector did not maintain documentation that he formally solicited proposals for his banking services in recent years and did not have a written agreement with his bank. In addition, the County Collector only received approximately a 2.25 percent interest rate on his funds while the county received approximately a 5.61 percent interest rate on its monies from its depository bank.

To ensure he is receiving competitive rates for interest earnings and service charges, the County Collector should solicit bids for banking services periodically and should enter into a contract with his bank, outlining the terms agreed to and the services to be received.

WE RECOMMEND the County Collector:

- A. File annual settlements annually as required by statute.
- B. Reconcile daily cash collections and the daily report of collections from the computer system to the paid tax receipts and the deposits into the bank account. In addition, the Collector should reconcile the amounts in his bank account to related liabilities and other reconciling items on a monthly basis. Any differences should be investigated and explained on the reconciliations.
- C. Deposit all monies received intact daily. If a change fund is needed, it should be maintained at an established amount. In addition, the practice of using receipts to make cash refunds should be discontinued.
- D. Periodically solicit proposals for banking services to ensure service charges and interest earnings are competitive and enter into a written agreement with his bank.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

- A. *The County Collector indicated that after the conversion to a new computerized property tax system in tax year 1999, they had concerns with the accuracy of the data they were obtaining to prepare the annual settlements. He indicated that they focused their efforts on ensuring that property taxes collected and abstracted were properly paid out to the taxing authorities. He stated he would make an effort to prepare annual settlements timely in the future.*

- B. *The County Collector indicated that while he agrees with the recommendation, he does not have the time and personnel to ensure these procedures are performed during the busy season. He indicated during the busy season his staff is focused on attending to taxpayers, posting payments and making daily deposits. The County Collector stated that he would attempt to implement the recommendation in September 2001 and will perform the reconciliations as time allows.*
- C. *The County Collector indicated his staff tries to deposit intact. He indicated he did not think it would be practical to discontinue using cash receipts to make small refunds, however he indicated he would try to better document cash receipt overages and underages in the daily cash receipts book to balance the tax receipts with the monies deposited.*
- D. *The County Collector stated that he has solicited proposals for banking services periodically, but has not retained the documentation. He indicated that in June 2001 the banks submitted new proposals for the handling of other county funds and that he awarded the contract for his account to his current bank based on its proposal. He indicated that the interest rate in the new proposal is competitive with the county's bank. The County Collector also stated he will contact the bank immediately to develop a written depository agreement.*

7.	Nursing Service Accounting Controls and Procedures
-----------	---

The Crawford County Nursing Service receives funds from various state and federal grants, as well as miscellaneous fees and donations. The following concerns were noted during our review of the Crawford County Nursing Service's accounting procedures:

- A. Receipt slips are not always prenumbered and are not issued for some monies received. Additionally, the receipt slips issued do not indicate the method of payment. As a result, the nursing service cannot reconcile the composition of receipt slips to the composition of transmittals to the County Treasurer. In addition, checks and money orders are not restrictively endorsed until transmittals are prepared. To adequately safeguard receipts and account for monies received, prenumbered receipt slips should be issued for all monies received and the composition of receipt slips should be reconciled to the composition of transmittals. In addition, checks and money orders should be restrictively endorsed immediately upon receipt.
- B. Receipts are not transmitted to the County Treasurer on a timely basis. Receipts are transmitted approximately once per week. During our cash count on April 9, 2001, we noted over \$400 in family planning and vital record fee receipts that had been on hand approximately one to two weeks. To adequately safeguard against theft or misuse of funds and to provide assurance that all receipts are properly transmitted, receipts should be transmitted on a daily basis or when accumulated receipts exceed \$100.
- C. The nursing service receives federal and state funds under various programs through the state Department of Health. The nursing service does not maintain summary records which track the amounts billed and the subsequent amounts received for

these various grants. Also, records pertaining to program expenditures and related reimbursements were not maintained in an organized fashion.

To adequately account for the various programs, the nursing service should develop summary records to monitor billings and the receipt of reimbursements.

WE RECOMMEND the Nursing Service:

- A. Issue prenumbered receipt slips for all monies received, include the method of payment on all receipt slips, reconcile the composition of receipt slips to the composition of transmittals to the County Treasurer and restrictively endorse all checks and money orders immediately upon receipt.
- B. Transmit monies to the County Treasurer daily or when accumulated receipts exceed \$100.
- C. Retain records in an organized manner and develop summary records to track the amounts billed and reimbursements received.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

- A. *The Nursing Service Administrator stated they have already implemented this recommendation. She indicated they have now hand-numbered all receipt slip books on hand, are issuing receipt slips for all monies received, are noting the method of payment on the receipt slips and are reconciling to the composition of monies turned over to the County Treasurer. She also stated all checks are now restrictively endorsed when received.*
- B. *The Nursing Service Administrator stated she agrees with the recommendation and said they are transmitting money more frequently and are trying to turn monies over to the County Treasurer as soon as possible after accumulated receipts exceed \$100.*
- C. *The Nursing Service Administrator stated she agrees with the recommendation and said she has now set up a ledger to track billings and reimbursements for each of the various state and federal grants.*

8.

E911

The E911 Director is responsible for preparing and submitting an annual budget to the E911 Board of Trustees for approval. The E911 Board then forwards the annual budget to the County Clerk for submission to the State Auditor's Office with the budgets of various other county funds. The following problems were noted regarding the E911 budgets.

- A. Actual expenditures exceeded budgeted amounts during the years ended December 31, 2000 and 1999 by approximately \$8,400 and \$36,500, respectively. The overspending was partly due to the unbudgeted repayment of old outstanding debt

and a tax anticipation note. No budget amendments authorizing the additional expenditures were prepared or filed.

It was ruled in *State ex rel. Strong v. Cribb*, 364 Mo. 1122, 273 S.W. 2d 246 (1954), that strict compliance with the county budget law is required by county officials. If there are valid reasons which necessitate excess disbursements, budget amendments should be made following the same process by which the annual budget is approved, including holding public hearings and filing the amended budget with the State Auditor's office. In addition, Section 50.662, RSMo 2000, provides that counties may amend the annual budget during any year in which the county receives additional funds which could not be estimated when the budget was adopted.

- B. Although the prior years' receipt and disbursement detail is derived from information entered by the E911 Director on the computerized accounting records, several inaccuracies were noted in the actual information presented for 2000 and 1999 and the budgets were not mathematically accurate. The budgets also did not include all projected receipts, including proceeds of \$95,000 from a tax anticipation note. In addition, the actual revenue category amounts were not accurate and did not agree between the 1999 and 2000 budgets. The total revenues per the budget detail pages were approximately \$100,000 greater than the total revenues reported on cash reconciliation page of the budget.

A complete, accurate and well-planned budget can serve as a useful management tool by establishing specific cost expectations and providing a means to effectively monitor costs and financial condition.

WE RECOMMEND the E911 Board:

- A. Not authorize disbursements in excess of budgeted amounts. If necessary, extenuating circumstances should be fully documented and budgets properly amended and filed with the County Clerk and the State Auditor's Office.
- B. Ensure that complete and accurate budgets that reflect all actual and anticipated revenues and expenditures are prepared.

AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

- A. *The E911 Director stated that he agrees with the recommendation. He indicated that he will monitor the budget activity more closely and will ensure the budgets are properly amended if actual expenditures are expected to exceed budgeted amounts.*
- B. *The E911 Director stated that he agrees with the recommendation. He stated they are planning to hire a consultant to provide assistance as needed in accounting and budget preparation and will ensure that budgets are complete and accurate in the future.*

This report is intended for the information of the management of Crawford County, Missouri, and other applicable government officials. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

Follow-Up on Prior Audit Findings

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
FOLLOW-UP ON PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, this section reports the auditor's follow-up on action taken by Crawford County, Missouri, on findings in the Management Advisory Report (MAR) of our audit report issued for the three years ended December 31, 1996.

The prior recommendations which have not been implemented, but are considered significant, are repeated in the current MAR. Although the remaining unimplemented recommendations are not repeated, the county should consider implementing those recommendations.

1. Budgetary Practices and Financial Reporting

- A. Formal budgets were not prepared and filed with the State Auditor's office for various county funds.
- B. Actual expenditures exceeded budgeted amounts for several funds.
- C. For the year ended December 31, 1994, a deficit General Revenue Fund balance was budgeted in the amount of \$10,739.
- D. The county did not publish the annual financial statements in a timely manner.
- E. The General Revenue Fund still owed the Special Road and Bridge Fund for prior excess three percent administrative fee transfers totaling approximately \$38,000.

Recommendation:

The County Commission:

- A. Ensure financial information for all special revenue funds is considered prior to finalization of the annual budgets and budgets be prepared for all county funds.
- B. Keep expenditures within the legal budgetary limits.
- C. Ensure that expenditures are limited to available resources and maintain balanced budgets as required by law.
- D. Publish financial statements timely as required by state law.
- E. Authorize the transfer of approximately \$38,000 from the General Revenue Fund to the Special Road and Bridge Fund.

Status:

- A& B. Not implemented. Although not repeated in the current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.
- C. Implemented.
- D. Not implemented. See MAR No. 3.
- E. Implemented. While the County Commission did not transfer the \$38,000 from the General Revenue Fund to the Road and Bridge Fund, administrative transfers from the Road and Bridge Fund to the General Fund in recent years have been less than the maximum allowed and have more than offset the previous amount owed to the Road and Bridge Fund.

2. Road and Bridge Equipment Controls and Procedures

- A. The county did not maintain a culvert pipe inventory record, nor did they perform a reconciliation between culvert pipe purchases and usage.
- B. The county did not have a written policy regarding the use of county-owned vehicles by road and bridge foremen and mechanics for commuting purposes. The county also did not follow Internal Revenue Service (IRS) guidelines for the reporting of fringe benefits relating to county-owned vehicles.

Recommendation:

The County Commission:

- A. Maintain a culvert pipe inventory record and periodically reconcile purchases, usage, and culvert pipes on hand.
- B. Comply with IRS guidelines for the reporting of fringe benefits relating to county-owned vehicles. In addition, the county should establish a written policy for road and bridge employees regarding appropriate use of county vehicles for commuting purposes.

Status:

- A. Implemented.
- B. Not implemented. See MAR No. 2.

3. County Commissioners' Mileage

Mileage claims of a former County Commissioner for use of his personal vehicle for county business lacked adequate and sufficient supporting documentation. In addition, the mileage reports submitted by another County Commissioner only indicated "road work" as the purpose and indicated the vehicle was driven very few personal miles.

Recommendation:

The County Commission provide complete and adequate documentation to support all mileage incurred. If such documentation cannot be provided, the Commissioners should be required to repay any unsubstantiated amounts.

Status:

Implemented.

4. Capital Improvement Sales Tax for the Handicapped Building

The County did not obtain legal guidance or develop a plan for the use of sales tax monies previously collected and dedicated for the purpose of building a workshop for the handicapped.

Recommendation:

The County Commission request legal guidance from the county Prosecuting Attorney or the State Attorney General on how these sales tax monies can be spent and develop a plan for the use of the monies on a timely basis.

Status:

Partially implemented. At December 31, 2000 the balance of the Handicap Building Fund was approximately \$142,000. The County Commission has received guidance from the Prosecuting Attorney indicating the funds must be spent on purchasing, constructing, or maintaining a workshop building as authorized by Chapter 205, RSMo and the ballot language. The County Commission has had several discussions with the Senate Bill 40 Board and the current workshop building's owner regarding purchasing the current facility and donating or leasing it to the Senate Bill 40 Board. However, a plan has not been finalized and the monies still have not been disbursed. Although not repeated in the current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.

5. Enhanced 911

See our audit report on Crawford County, Missouri, for the two years ended December 31, 1998 (report number 99-79).

6. Federal Financial Assistance

- A. The county did not establish cash management control procedures to ensure federal monies were disbursed timely.
- B. The county was unable to provide documentation, such as timesheets, to support some of the reimbursement claims filed for the federal grant to operate the Cash Crop Program. As a result, costs of \$777 were questioned.

Recommendation:

The County Commission:

- A. Ensure federal monies are disbursed on a timely basis.
- B. Resolve the questioned costs with the grantor agency.

Status:

- A. Partially implemented. During our audit, we noted one reimbursement, totaling approximately \$4,900, that was not disbursed within three days of receipt. Although not repeated in the current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.
- B. Not implemented. While the County Commission has not resolved the questioned costs with the grantor agency; the county is no longer involved in the Operation Cash Crop Program. Although not repeated in the current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.

7. Personnel Policies and Procedures

- A. County employee timesheets submitted to the County Clerk indicated only the total number of hours worked each month rather than a breakdown by day of the actual hours worked by the employee. In addition, the County Clerk's office did not maintain records of compensatory time earned or used for some employees.
- B. The County Clerk did not prepare an IRS Form 1099-MISC for all applicable payments.

Recommendation:

The County Commission:

- A. Require all county employees to complete time sheets which reflect actual time worked and leave taken. In addition, control records of compensatory time should be maintained by the County Clerk's office for all county employees.

- B. Require the County Clerk issue IRS Forms 1099-MISC for all applicable expenditures, as required.

Status:

- A. Implemented.
- B. Not implemented. During our test of expenditures, we noted one instance in which the County Clerk did not issue an IRS Form 1099-MISC when applicable. Although not repeated in the current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.

8. General Fixed Asset Records and Procedures

- A. Annual listings of additions and deletions made during the year, as well as a listing of fixed assets at December 31 of each year, were not prepared from the computerized fixed asset records.
- B. The county did not have an established method of disposing of property, including obtaining written authorization from the County Commission.
- C. Property additions were not always recorded on the fixed asset records and some items were recorded at an amount different from the actual cost.
- D. The County Clerk did not document that she performed annual inventories of fixed assets as required by state law.

Recommendation:

- A. The County Clerk prepare listings of property additions and deletions and reconcile such listings to expenditures and authorizations for property disposal on a periodic basis. In addition, the County Clerk should generate and maintain a year end computerized general fixed asset listing.
- B. The County Commission establish a formal method of disposing of general fixed assets. Written authorization for all property dispositions should be obtained.
- C. The County Clerk properly record all general fixed asset additions.
- D. The County Clerk perform and document her review of annual inventories of fixed assets as required by state law.

Status:

- A. Partially implemented. While the County Clerk can now prepare annual listings of property additions and deletions, such listings are not reconciled to expenditure records and authorizations for property disposal on a periodic basis. Although not repeated in the current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.
- B&C. Not implemented. See MAR No. 4.
- D. Implemented.

9. Property Tax System

- A. The County Clerk did not maintain an account book with the County Collector.
- B. The County Assessor made changes to the property taxes for additions and abatements without obtaining prior approval from the County Commission. In addition, the County Assessor did not notify the County Clerk of such changes.
- C. Passwords and user identifications (IDs) for the property tax computer system were not changed periodically by the County Assessor, County Collector, and County Clerk.
- D. The County Clerk did not accurately prepare annual abstracts of assessed valuations and property tax collections.

Recommendation:

- A. The County Clerk appropriately maintain her account book with the County Collector and the County Commission use it to verify the County Collector's annual settlement.
- B. The Assessor notify the County Clerk and obtain approval from the County Commission when making additions and abatements.
- C. The County Commission establish procedures to periodically change passwords and user IDs and restrict access to computer files to only those individuals who need to use the information.
- D. The County Clerk ensure aggregate abstracts are accurate and the County Collector review the aggregate abstracts for errors.

Status:

- A&B. Not implemented. See MAR No. 5.

- C. Partially implemented. The County Commission receives and approves monthly reports listing additions and abatements. However, the Commission does not reconcile the additions and abatements to the property tax records. See MAR No. 5.
- D. Partially implemented. While the County Clerk now uses the proper methodology to prepare the aggregate abstracts, an addition error was made on the 1999 aggregate abstract. Although not repeated in our current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.

10. County Collector's Accounting Controls and Procedures

- A. The County Collector did not perform adequate monthly reconciliations between amounts in the bank account, various liabilities, and other reconciling items to which the cash balance relates.
- B. The County Collector did not deposit receipts intact, did not maintain the change fund at a set amount, and used some cash collections to make small refunds.
- C. Surtax collections were improperly allocated to the various political subdivisions.
- D. The County Collector's bank account balance was not adequately collateralized at various times.
- E. The County Collector did not include prior years' delinquent personal property tax amounts on his annual settlements.

Recommendation:

The County Collector:

- A. Reconcile the amounts in his bank account to the related liabilities and other reconciling items on a monthly basis. Any differences should be investigated and explained on the reconciliations.
- B. Deposit all monies received intact daily. If a change fund is needed, it should be maintained at an established amount. In addition, the practice of using receipts to make cash refunds should be discontinued.
- C. Calculate the percentages that should have been used for each of the two years ended February 28, 1997, and apply these percentages to the respective surtax collections. The newly calculated distributions should be compared to the actual distributions and adjustments made to future distributions for material variances. Future distributions of surtax collections should then take into consideration the current assessed valuation for Subclass 3 commercial property for each year compared to the 1984 valuation for each political subdivision as required by state law.

- D. Ensure adequate collateral securities are pledged for all funds on deposit in excess of FDIC coverage.
- E. Ensure that all delinquent tax amounts are properly recorded on the annual settlements.

Status:

A,B,
& E. Not implemented. See MAR No. 6.

C&D. Implemented.

11. Sheriff's Accounting Controls and Procedures

- A. Receipts were not deposited intact on a timely basis and receipts were not posted to cash control records on a timely basis.
- B. Bond monies were not turned over to the Associate Circuit Court on a timely basis.
- C. The Sheriff did not remit fees to the County Treasurer on a monthly basis.
- D. Checks received through the mail were not restrictively endorsed until the deposit was made.
- E. The method of payment was not always indicated on the receipt slips.

Recommendation:

The Sheriff:

- A. Deposit receipts intact daily or when accumulated receipts exceed \$100 and post all receipts to the cash control records on a timely basis.
- B. Ensure bond monies are remitted to the Associate Circuit Court on a timely basis.
- C. Remit all fees to the County Treasurer on a monthly basis.
- D. Restrictively endorse checks immediately upon receipt.
- E. Indicate the method of payment on receipt slips and reconcile the composition of receipts to the amounts deposited.

Status:

A, B,
D&E. Implemented.

C. Not implemented. During our audit, we noted several reports that were not turned over until the end of the following month. In addition, the January 2000 report was not turned over until March 30, 2000. Although not repeated in our current MAR, our recommendation remains as stated above.

12. Ex Officio Recorder's Controls and Procedures

Accounting duties were not adequately segregated and there was no documentation that monthly bank reconciliations were performed.

Recommendation:

The Ex Officio Recorder ensure that accounting duties are adequately segregated and/or that independent reviews are performed and documented as necessary. In addition, monthly bank reconciliations should be performed.

Status:

Implemented. While accounting duties still are not adequately segregated, monthly bank reconciliations are now prepared by the Deputy Recorder and reviewed and approved by the Ex Officio Recorder of Deeds. The Ex Officio Recorder of Deeds also now reconciles reports of monies collected to deposits into the bank account.

13. Prosecuting Attorney's Accounting Controls and Procedures

- A. Bad check collection fees were only deposited approximately four times a month.
- B. A sequential listing of computer-generated receipt slips issued for fee and restitution monies was not prepared and a comparison of receipts to fees recorded in bad check cases was not performed.
- C. The Prosecuting Attorney did not advertise for bids for the purchase of office computer equipment, but rather solicited bids through telephone calls.

Recommendation:

The Prosecuting Attorney:

- A. Deposit all monies daily or when the accumulation of receipts exceeds \$100.

- B. Compare the numerical sequence of receipt slips to fees distributed and reconcile all payments received to deposits made.
- C. Advertise for bids on all purchases of \$3,000 or more in accordance with Section 50.660, RSMo 1995.

Status:

A, B,
&C. Implemented.

STATISTICAL SECTION

History, Organization, and
Statistical Information

CRAWFORD COUNTY, MISSOURI
HISTORY, ORGANIZATION,
AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Organized in 1829, the county of Crawford was named after William H. Crawford, a Georgia statesman. Crawford county is a county-organized, third-class county and is part of the 42nd Judicial Circuit. The county seat is Steelville.

Crawford County's government is composed of a three-member county commission and separate elected officials performing various tasks. The county commission has mainly administrative duties in setting tax levies, appropriating county funds, appointing board members and trustees of special services, accounting for county property, maintaining county roads and bridges, and performing miscellaneous duties not handled by other county officials.

Principal functions of these other officials relate to judicial courts, law enforcement, property assessment, property tax collections, conduct of elections, and maintenance of financial and other records of importance to the county's citizens.

Counties typically spend a large portion of their receipts to support general county operations and to build and maintain roads and bridges. The following chart shows from where Crawford County received its money in 2000 and 1999 to support the county General Revenue and Special Road and Bridge Funds:

SOURCE	2000		1999	
	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL
Property taxes	\$ 485,149	13	499,977	13
Sales taxes	1,424,546	38	1,333,031	36
Federal and state aid	1,280,700	34	1,387,349	37
Fees, interest, and other	573,497	15	533,737	14
Total	\$ 3,763,892	100	3,754,094	100

The following chart shows how Crawford County spent monies in 2000 and 1999 from the General Revenue and Special Road and Bridge Funds:

USE	2000		1999	
	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL
General county government	\$ 1,044,217	28	1,010,969	29
Public safety	964,445	26	814,188	24
Highways and roads	1,712,469	46	1,608,184	47
Total	\$ 3,721,131	100	3,433,341	100

The county maintains approximately 31 county bridges and 585 miles of county roads.

The county's population was 14,828 in 1970 and 19,173 in 1990. The following chart shows the county's change in assessed valuation since 1970:

	Year Ended December 31,				
	2000	1999	1985*	1980**	1970**
	(in millions)				
Real estate	\$ 105.1	102.8	61.4	30.8	18.3
Personal property	45.4	40.9	13.5	6.7	4.0
Railroad and utilities	17.3	16.2	6.3	6.1	4.7
Total	\$ 167.8	159.9	81.2	43.6	27.0

* First year of statewide reassessment.

** Prior to 1985, separate assessments were made for merchants' and manufacturers' property. These amounts are included in real estate.

Crawford County's property tax rates per \$100 of assessed valuations were as follows:

	Year Ended December 31,	
	2000	1999
General Revenue Fund	\$.0790	.0800
Special Road and Bridge Fund	.2203	.2200
Senior Citizens Service Fund	.0500	N/A
Senate Bill 40 Board Fund	.1000	.1000

Property taxes attach as an enforceable lien on property as of January 1. Taxes are levied on September 1 and payable by December 31. Taxes paid after December 31 are subject to penalties. The county bills and collects property taxes for itself and most other local governments. Taxes collected were distributed as follows:

	Year Ended February 28 (29),	
	2001 *	2000 *
State of Missouri	\$ 49,839	48,763
General Revenue Fund	137,812	134,878
Special Road and Bridge Fund	362,021	353,289
Assessment Fund	79,112	77,234
Hospital	21,314	20,372
Senate Bill 40 Board Fund	161,146	157,885
School districts	5,563,505	5,445,377
Library district	154,858	151,669
Ambulance district	441,234	435,104
Fire protection district	247,552	243,789
Junior College	212,676	210,800
County Employees' Retirement Fund	38,229	38,540
Senior Citizen's Service Fund	65,538	0
Cities	5,254	6,327
Surtax	120,553	121,239
County Clerk	376	409
Commissions and fees:		
Official	169	181
General Revenue Fund	158,363	156,709
Total	\$ 7,819,551	7,602,565

* Preliminary totals, pending completion of the annual settlements.

Percentages of current taxes collected were as follows:

	Year Ended February 28 (29),	
	2001	2000
Real estate	89 %	89 %
Personal property	88	86
Railroad and utilities	100	100

Crawford County also has the following sales taxes; rates are per \$1 of retail sales:

	Rate	Expiration Date	Required Property Tax Reduction
General	\$.0500	None	50 %
Capital improvements	.0500	2003	None

The elected officials and their compensation paid for the year ended December 31 (except as noted) are indicated below.

Officeholder	2001	2000	1999
County-Paid Officials:			
Art Hughes, Presiding Commissioner	\$	25,299	24,572
Bobby Ray, Associate Commissioner		23,249	22,572
Fred Hartung, Associate Commissioner		23,249	22,572
Connie Smith, County Clerk		35,226	34,200
Sid Pearson, Prosecuting Attorney		41,715	40,500
Albert Englebrecht, Jr., Sheriff		37,080	36,000
Lucille Giles, County Treasurer		26,067	25,308
Paul Hutson, County Coroner		6,695	6,500
Lois Dicus, Public Administrator *		10,000	10,000
Daniel Gladden, County Collector, year ended February 28 (29),	37,427	36,337	
Kerry Summers, County Assessor, year ended August 31,**		36,126	35,100
Jim Adams, County Surveyor ***		0	0

* Includes fees received from probate cases.

** Includes \$900 annual compensation received from the state.

*** Compensation on a fee basis.

State-Paid Officials:

Karen McPeters, Circuit Clerk and Ex Officio Recorder of Deeds		46,127	44,292
J. Kent Howald, Associate Circuit Judge		97,382	87,235

A breakdown of employees (excluding the elected officials) by office at December 31, 2000, is as follows:

Office	Number of Employees Paid by	
	County	State
County Commission	0	0
Circuit Clerk and Ex Officio Recorder of Deeds	2	5 *
County Clerk	4 **	0
Prosecuting Attorney	10 ***	0
Sheriff	25 ****	0
County Treasurer	0	0
County Coroner	1 *	0
Public Administrator	0	0
County Collector	4 **	0
County Assessor	3	0
County Surveyor	0	0
Associate/Probate Division	0	6 *
Road and Bridge	21	0
Nursing Service	7 *	0
Total	<u>77</u>	<u>11</u>

In addition, the county pays a proportionate share of the salaries of other circuit court-appointed employees. Crawford County's share of the 42nd Judicial Circuit's expenses is 31 percent.

- * Includes one part-time employee
- ** Includes two part-time employees
- *** Includes five part-time employees
- **** Includes three part-time employees